



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,777	01/12/2001	Maria Isabel Gonzalez	5771-P1-01-BD	9663
7590	11/19/2003		EXAMINER	
Warner-Lambert Company			HUI, SAN MING R	
2800 Plymouth Road				
Ann Arbor, MI 48105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/759,777

Applicant(s)

GONZALEZ ET AL.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,14 and 16-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,14 and 16-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 4, 2003 has been entered.

Claims 1, 4-10, 14, and 16-46 are pending.

The outstanding rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph are withdrawn in view of the amendments filed August 4, 2003.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 4-10, 14, and 16-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for bombesin antagonists listed I pages 8-35 in the instant specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for other bombesin antagonists. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention

commensurate in scope with these claims. In the instant case, the specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that define a suitable sexual dysfunction treating "bombesin antagonists". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "bombesin antagonists" examples are set forth. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required since there is no structural, physical or chemical structures associated with them. The only common properties among them are their capabilities of blocking or antagonizing bombesin receptors. In other words, the claims

are drawn to a method of treating sexual dysfunction by employing potentially any compounds known to men. Because of the lack of guidance to identify which compound is suitable to be used in the instant invention, the skilled artisan would be required to perform undue experimentation to screen for suitable candidate in order to ascertain suitable bombesin antagonist compounds. The employment of bombesin receptor antagonists in treating sexual dysfunction is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "bombesin antagonist(s)", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4-10, 14, and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howell et al. (WO 98/07718), WO96/28214, and Hurel et al. in view of Merck Manual and sildenafil prescribing information, references of record.

Howell et al. (WO 98/07718) teaches a method of treating and/or preventing depression employing a oral pharmaceutical composition/dosage form comprising non-peptide bombesin receptor antagonists (see particularly, abstract, page 10 and claims 11-12).

WO96/28214 teaches bombesin inhibits smooth muscle contraction, splanchnia vasodilation and bombesin antagonist negates these bombesin-induced biological effects (See page 5, lines 18-38).

Hurel et al. teaches that bombesin-like peptide antagonists have vasoactive properties (see page 1243).

The primary references taken together do not particularly teach the employment of bombesin-like peptide and/or non-peptide antagonists in a method of treating sexual

dysfunction. Neither do they teach the combination of vasodilators, neurotransmitter antagonists and/or agonists or a hormone like compound in its method of treating sexual dysfunction.

Merck Manual teaches depression, low testosterone level and vascular abnormalities as causes of sexual dysfunction (see pages 1575 and 1577-78).

Sildenafil is a known PDE5 inhibitor vasodilator employed in the treatment of sexual dysfunction (see pages 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ bombesin-like peptide and/or non-peptide antagonists in a method of treating sexual dysfunction. It would also have been obvious to combine the bombesin receptor antagonist with vasodilators, neurotransmitter antagonists and/or agonists or a hormone like compound in a method of treating sexual dysfunction.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ bombesin-like peptide and/or non-peptide antagonists in a method of treating sexual dysfunction because (1) they are known to be employed in methods of treating depression which is known to be an underlying cause of sexual dysfunction; (2) they are known to be vasoactive which are known to be useful in treating sexual dysfunction. One of ordinary skill in the art would have also been motivated to combine the bombesin receptor antagonist with vasodilators, neurotransmitter antagonists and/or agonists or a hormone like compound in a method of treating sexual dysfunction since they are all known to be useful in treating sexual dysfunction. Combining agents that are known to be useful for the same purpose in a combination composition to be used for the same purpose is

known to be within the skill of the artisan and therefore obvious, see *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069.

Claims 24-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howell et al. (WO 98/07718), WO96/28214, and Hurel et al. in view of Merck Manual and sildenafil prescribing information, references of record as applied to claims 1, 4-10, 14, and 16-23 above, and further in view of Leiblum (International Journal of Impotence Research, 1998; 10(Suppl 2): S104-S106), Levin (Exp. Clin. Endocrinol., 1991;98(2):61-69), Gioco et al. (US Patent 5,565,466).

Leiblum teaches different sexual disorders are affected by either mood disorder such as depression, which would reduce the desire of sexual activities, or vascular factors such as decreased vaginal lubrication which can cause pain during intercourse and female sexual arousal disorder (see particularly page S105, col. 1, second paragraph – col. 2 and page S106, col. 1).

Levin teaches VIP can increase the vaginal lubrication and induce arousal in female patients (see particularly the abstract).

Gioco et al. teaches a method of modulating the excitatory phase of male and female sexual response using vasodilating agents such as phentolamine, yohimbine,  $\alpha$ -adrenergic vasodilator, and imipramine (See col. 12, line 11 to col. 13, line 31, 45, and 66, Examples 3 and 4; also particularly claims 14 and 17).



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the herein secondary agents with bombesin antagonist in a method of treating sexual dysfunction.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the herein secondary agents with bombesin antagonist in a method of treating sexual dysfunction because various sexual dysfunction are known to be affected by various factors such as depression and vascular. Combining the herein claimed secondary agents, which are known to correct and treat the underlying conditions that negatively affect sexual activities individually, with bombesin antagonist into a single composition for the very same purpose would be obvious (see *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069), absent evidence to the contrary.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 4, 2003 averring Hurel not teaching bombesinantagonist as vasodilators have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the discussion above in regard to the teachings of WO96/28214.

Applicant's arguments filed August 4, 2003 averring even bombesin-like peptide as useful to treat hypertension, the prior art does not provide reasonable expectation of success have been considered, but are not found persuasive. The teaching of the cited prior art clearly provides the reasonable expectation of success in two ways: (1) they are known to be employed in methods of treating depression which is known to be an

underlying cause of sexual dysfunction; (2) they are known to be vasoactive which are known to be useful in treating sexual dysfunction.

Applicant's further arguments filed August 4, 2003 averring even bombesin-like peptide as useful to treat depression, the prior art does not provide reasonable expectation of success since some antidepressant causing sexual dysfunction have been considered, but are not found persuasive. The antidepressant that are causing sexual dysfunction are through a specific neurological pathway, e.g., serotonin reuptake inhibitors usually cause sexual dysfunction. However, there is no reason or teachings of record to provide the reason that bombesin receptor antagonist will cause sexual dysfunction in the same way as some of the antidepressants do. Teaching away has to be clear. There is no clear teaching away present in the references of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Application/Control Number: 09/759,777

Page 10

Art Unit: 1617

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'San-ming Hui', written in a cursive style.

San-ming Hui  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1617